

Hammarskjöld pointed out that Article 99 of the Charter—which allows the Secretary-General, on his own initiative, to bring matters to the Security Council's attention when in his view they may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security—makes him clearly a political rather than a purely administrative official.

In practice, successive Secretaries-General, including Hammarskjöld, have invoked this article very sparingly. I myself have never yet found it necessary to do so. But the fact that the Secretary-General has this power crucially affects the way he is treated by the Security Council, and by the Member States in general.

Few people now question the responsibility of the Secretary-General to act politically, or to make public pronouncements on political issues.

In fact, the boot today is if anything on the other foot: I find myself called on to make official statements on almost everything that happens in the world, from royal marriages to the possibility of human cloning!

I do my best to satisfy this demand with due respect for the decisions of the Security Council and General Assembly. But those bodies would find it very strange if on each occasion I sought their approval before opening my mouth!

Their members can, and do, take exception to some of my statements—and thank goodness they do. There must be freedom of speech for governments, as well as for international officials! But they do not question my right to make such statements, according to my own understanding of the purposes and principles of the United Nations as set out in the Charter.

No doubt Dag Hammarskjöld would also disagree with some of the specific positions I have taken. But I suspect he would envy me the discretion I enjoy in deciding what to say. And I have no doubt he would strongly endorse the principle that the Secretary-General must strive to make himself an authentic and independent voice of the international community.

What he might not have foreseen is the way our concept of that community has developed in recent years. In his time it was essentially a community of separate nations or peoples, who for all practical purposes were represented by States.

So if we go back to the things about today's world that we would have to explain to him, if he unexpectedly joined us now, probably the most difficult for him to adjust to would be the sheer complexity of a world in which individuals and groups of all kinds are constantly interacting—across frontiers and across oceans, economically, socially and culturally—without expecting or receiving any permission, let alone assistance, from their national governments.

He might well find it difficult to identify the precise role, in such a world, of a body like the United Nations, whose Charter presupposes the division of the world into sovereign and equal States, and in which the peoples of the world are represented essentially by their governments.

He might find that difficult—and if so, he would not be alone! But I am convinced he would relish the challenge. And I am sure he would not stray from his fundamental conviction that the essential task of the United Nations is to protect the weak against the strong.

In the long term, the vitality and viability of the Organization depend on its ability to perform that task, by adapting itself to changing realities. That, I believe, is the biggest test it faces in the new century.

How would Hammarskjöld approach that task?

First of all he would insist, quite correctly, that States are still the main holders of political authority in the world, and are likely to remain so. Indeed, the more democratic they become—the more genuinely representative of, and accountable to, their peoples—the greater also will be their political legitimacy. And therefore it is entirely proper, as well as inevitable, that they will remain the political masters of the United Nations.

He would also insist, I am sure, on the continuing responsibility of States to maintain international order—and, indeed, on their collective responsibility, which their leaders solemnly recognised in last year's Millennium Declaration, “to uphold the principles of human dignity, equality and equity at the global level”.

And he might well say that, with a few honourable exceptions, the more fortunate countries in this world are not living up to that responsibility, so long as they do not fulfill their longstanding commitments to much higher levels of development assistance, to much more generous debt relief, and to duty- and quota- free access for exports from the least developed countries.

But then he would also see that his own lifetime coincided, in most countries, with the high watermark of State control over the lives of citizens. And he would see that States today generally tax and spend a smaller proportion of their citizens' wealth than they did 40 years ago.

From this he might well conclude that we should not rely exclusively on State action to achieve our objectives on the international level, either.

A great deal, he would think, is likely to depend on non-State actors in the system—private companies, voluntary agencies or pressure groups, philanthropic foundations, universities and think tanks, and, of course, creative individuals.

And that thought would surely feed into his reflection on the role of the United Nations.

Can it confine itself, in the 21st century, to the role of coordinating action by States? Or should it reach out further?

Is it not obliged, in order to fulfill the purposes of the Charter, to form partnerships with all these different actors? To listen to them, to guide them, and to urge them on?

Above all, to provide a framework of shared values and understanding, within which their free and voluntary efforts can interact, and reinforce each other, instead of getting in each other's way?

Perhaps it is presumptuous of me to suggest that this would be part of Hammarskjöld's vision of the role of the United Nations in the 21st century—because it is, of course, my own vision.

No doubt if he were alive today he would offer us something nobler and more profound.

But I like to think, Ladies and Gentlemen, that what I have just described would find some place in it.

Thank you very much.

HONORING MS. GARLAND MILLER

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 2001

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I have a longstanding commitment to supporting women who venture out into the professional world. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and honoring a constituent, Ms. Garland Miller, as a woman who has had im-

mense success in founding and running her own company.

Ms. Miller is the President of Schoolfield and Associates, a highly successful book-keeping and association management firm in my district. I would like to congratulate Ms. Miller, who is celebrating 25 years of business in Chevy Chase and Bethesda, Maryland. A graduate of the University of Maryland, Ms. Miller and her family have lived in my district for generations. She has over 100 clients, and employs several people. Thanks to leaders like Ms. Miller, women entrepreneurs have made great strides in the business world. She serves as a role model for other women in the business community. On behalf of my colleagues, I would like to wish Ms. Garland Miller many more successful years.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ED BRYANT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 2001

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was inadvertently delayed getting back to Washington from my district, and as a result missed Rollcall votes 349 and 350. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on both votes. As an original co-sponsor of H.R. 717, I regret being unable to cast a vote in favor of this important legislation that will have a positive effect on those children who suffer from Duchenne muscular dystrophy.

HONORING HUBERT TABOR FOR HIS DEDICATED SERVICE

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 2001

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, to place your life in harms way in order to defend our Nation is indeed a noble and honorable action. Hubert Douglas Tabor dedicated himself by serving in World War II and is certainly worthy of the praise and admiration of this body. During the campaign in Northern Burma, Hubert placed his well-being before all else in order to ensure a victory for the Allies in that war-stricken area.

Hubert was raised on a farm in Colorado. Throughout his time there, he grew tired of horses and wished to escape from the farm life by signing up for the Army. However, after entering the Army, the Army recognized that Hubert possessed superior riding skills and was sent to Ft. Riley, Kansas to be a member of the 124th Cavalry. This unit was the last mounted cavalry in the Army and it was with the 124th that Hubert deservedly received his silver spurs due to his accomplishments in the service. Upon his relocation to Burma, his role was that of a packer.

The 124th Cavalry, teamed with the 56th Cavalry and the 613th Field Artillery Battalion, was charged with the duty of opening the Burma Road that was closed by the Japanese. As the team trekked across the Himalayan landscape, the Japanese enemy was encountered at night. Although Hubert had several close calls during his service, perhaps